



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,474	12/13/2000	Jackie Zhanhong Wu	PRPL3013	1606

23488 7590 05/21/2004

GERALD B ROSENBERG
NEW TECH LAW
285 HAMILTON AVE
SUITE 520
PALO ALTO, CA 94301

EXAMINER

TRIEU, LAURENT L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/738,474

Applicant(s)

WU ET AL.

Examiner

Laurent L Trieu

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 have been examined.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 11 refers to itself, namely "The system of Claim 11". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davis et al., US Patent 6,282, 522 B1.

Regarding claim 1 –

- Wherein said repository server system includes a data store that stores user data – "Data store 64 controls the storage of purchase transactions and totals" (Column 4, lines 60-61)
- Wherein said repository server system provides said Web page form with a clickable user interface control as served to said user computer system, said control including a user data request, issuable by said user computer system and corresponding to said Web page form – "Also, the user interface provides instructions and/or buttons

for the customer to interact with terminal application 60 in order to purchase goods and/or Services” (Column 4, lines 40-43)

- Wherein said repository server system is responsive to said user data request to provide a user data response, corresponding to said user data request, to said user computer system - “Also, the user interface provides instructions and/or buttons for the customer to interact with terminal application 60 in order to purchase goods and/or Services” (Column 4, lines 40-43)

Regarding claims 2 and 3 – claim 1 wherein said user data request identifies a mapping between data stored by said data store and said web page form – “Each transaction initiated by a user has a transaction identifier Merchant server 208 generates a unique identification of the transaction, completes other required parameters, encrypts as appropriate, and builds an HTML page and sends it to the client terminal” (Column 13, lines 58-67)

Regarding claim 4 - claim 3 wherein the data requirements of said Web page for are defined independent of the form of said user data as stored by said repository server system and wherein said repository server system provides said user data in conformance with said user data request – Davis discloses, “Merchant server 208 may include databases, CGI scripts and back-office programs that produce HTML pages for an Internet user” (Column 13, lines 52-54) and “In step 606 the merchant server builds an HTML page that includes the following client applet parameters:... ”(Column 15, lines

36+). The "Web pages" (HTML) are created by the CGI scripts and/or back-office programs independent of the user forms that are generated upon a user's request.

Regarding claim 5 –

- a) Encoding a specification of client requested user data in a Web page served, by the request of a user, from a client server to a user computer system, wherein said specification defines a non-identity named data correspondence between said client requested user data and user data stored by said repository server – "The client module interacts 235 with the stored-value card and builds a draw request message containing related card information, the purchase amount, and other information supplied by the merchant server" (Column 13, line 67 – Column 14, line 3)
- b) Enabling said user to issue, by a single click, a data request including said specification to said repository server – "The user then selects an appropriate button on the merchant web site to indicate what the user wishes to purchase" (Column 14, lines 47-49)
- c) Providing a data response from said repository server providing user data consistent with said specification – "Next, in step 510 the user receives s a total sale amount from the merchant server..." (Column 14, lines 49-50)

Art Unit: 2137

Regarding claim 6 – 9, Davis discloses “Most often, a card has a card number that is associated with the consumer's name in a database on the Web server. This card number is transmitted to the Web server as part of the card signature, or in a similar fashion. Thus, an authenticated card used in this embodiment to redeem services may be matched to the appropriate consumer” (Column 25, lines 8-13)

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shafron et al., Patent Publication No. 2002/0186255 A1, hereafter referred to as Shafron.

Regarding claim 10 – Shafron discloses:

Wherein said coded message includes a partner site identification (“A supported merchant file contains a list of all supported merchants, including their respective Internet address” – Paragraph 133) provided from said partner side, a user account identification (“the user's first name is identified as ‘contactFirstName’ - Paragraph 139) and a mapped identification of partner-side field to be filled (“Thus, the present invention maps the fields in the wallet database to the fields in the supported merchant file” – Paragraph 139), said repository server providing for the verification of said partner site identification and said user account identification – “The shopping assistant code also compares the intercepted Internet address with the Internet addresses of supported merchants by comparing the intercepted address with a supported merchant file containing Internet addresses of supported merchants” (Paragraph 128) and “The

Art Unit: 2137

server 102 compares the user data (e.g., ID and SK) with data previously stored in that user's wallet on the wallet database 106" (Paragraph 143)

- Wherein said repository server selectively generates a second coded message directed to said partner-site containing login information appropriate to complete the logon of said user onto said partner site – "The user's wallet is securely transmitted by the server 102" (Paragraph 144, line 10+)

Regarding claim 11 – As understood to refer to claim 10, wherein said repository server operates to validate said user account identification against information held by said repository server specific to said user and said partner site identification against information held by said repository server specific to said parent site and where said repository server generates said second coded message based on information held in said user account that correlates to said partner site – "The server 102 compares the user data (e.g., ID and SK) with data previously stored in that user's wallet on the wallet database 106..." (Paragraph 143)

4. Claims 12–14, 16–18, 20–24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haverstock et al, US Patent No. 6701376, hereafter referred to as Haverstock.

Art Unit: 2137

Regarding claim 12 –

a) First providing, in response to the activation of a control associated with a Web page served to a user computer system provided by said partner site computer system, a coded request message for confidential information to a predefined repository server system – “The server receives a URL-based request for a non-HTML object (e.g., document or database) from a web browser via a HTTP server” (Column 3, Lines 48-50)

b) Second providing, in response to receipt of said coded request message, a response message from said predefined repository server system containing a release set of confidential user information to said user computer system – “The interface module transmits the request to a non-HTML server module.” (Column 3, Lines 54+)

Regarding claims 13 and 14 – Haverstock discloses, “When a system user “clicks” on the representation, a URL request for that view is transmitted to HTTP server module 30” (Column 14, lines 67+)

Regarding claim 16 – Haverstock discloses:

a) Providing, from a client computer system to a user computer system, a coded request for first user data associated with a Web page – “The server receives a URL-based request for a non-HTML object (e.g., document or database) from a web browser via a HTTP server” (Column 3, Lines 48-50)

Art Unit: 2137

b) Forwarding said coded request, selectively based on action performed on said user computer system relative to said Web page, to a data repository system – “The interface module transmits the request to a non-HTML server module.” (Column 3, Lines 54+)

c) Receiving, by said user computer system, a coded response from said data repository system including second user data – “The interface module translates the non-HTML object to a HTML object, and passes it to the HTTP server module” (Column 3, lines 58+)

d) Providing, by said user computer system, said second user data to said client computer system relative to said Web page – The HTTP server module transfers the HTML object to the web browser which presents the HTML object (Column 3, lines 60+)

Regarding claims 17 and 18 – Haverstock discloses: “the system comprises a novel web server for a client/server network and a terminal comprising a standard web browser” (Column 3, lines 41+) and “When a system user “clicks” on the representation, a URL request for that view is transmitted to HTTP server module 30” (Column 14, lines 67+)

Regarding claim 20 –

Art Unit: 2137

a) Issuing, in response to a single user click on a user interface control provided on a Web page served from a client computer system, a user data request determined by said client computer system specific to said Web page from said user computer system to a data repository system over said communications network - "The server receives a URL-based request for a non-HTML object (e.g., document or database) from a web browser via a HTTP server" (Column 3, Lines 48-50)

b) Returning, subject to the secure identification of said client computer system and said user computer system relative to said user data request, user data corresponding to said user data request – The HTTP server module transfers the HTML object to the web browser which presents the HTML object (Column 3, lines 60+)

Regarding claim 21 – "For example, a document may contain certain fields that are access controlled, whereby, depending on who the user is (e.g., based on the user's role) one or another field may be displayed. If a user's role changes (e.g., access privileges revoked), dynamic generation allows the system to update a user's role with the current privileges and restrict access as required" (Column 7, lines 49+)

Regarding claims 22-24 – Haverstock discloses, "Before a system user is granted access to an object within the system, the system may authenticate the system user.... If the identification and password do not match the identification and password stored in the system, the system user is not authenticated and access is denied" (Column 7, lines 33-40"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverstock in view of Wood et al, US Patent 6,668,322 B1, hereafter referred to as Wood.

Regarding claims 15 and 19 – While Haverstock discloses, “Authentication: Confirming who a user is with user names and passwords via a directory” (Column 7, lines 62+), however, Haverstock does not explicitly teach authenticating across partner sites. Wood teaches an access system where “Session credentials are used to maintain continuity of a persistent session across multiple accesses to one or more information resources, and in some embodiments, across credential level changes” (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further extend Haverstock’s teachings to include the specifics of persistence across multiple resources. This action provides a uniform security policy across a set of resources and creates a single integrated enterprise from among the partner sites (see Wood, Col. 1, lines 58 – 65)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurent L Trieu whose telephone number is 703-305-0712. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Morse can be reached on 703-308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LLT
AU 2137

14 May 2004

Matthew P. Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137